

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-52, allowed claims 1-34, rejected claims 35, 41 and 47, and objected to claims 36-40, 42-46, and 48-52. This paper requests entry of an amendment that would amend claims 35, 41 and 47, leaving claims 1-52 in the application.

In a telephone interview on Feb. 18, 2004, the Examiner indicated that by incorporating a definition of "coherent processing" into claims 35, 41 and 47, those claims could be made to distinguish the invention as claimed there from the cited art. The present amendment incorporates a definition of coherent processing according to the disclosure at page 12, first full paragraph.


At paragraph 3 of the Office action, claims 35, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Akazawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,479). In view of the telephone interview and the changes to claims 35, 41 and 47, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 of claims 35, 41, and 47 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

March 5, 2004

Date
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter, Reg. No. 41,266
tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955